

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and objections are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner alleges that the Applicant's arguments have been considered. However, they are not persuasive as to certain matters.

The Examiner alleges that the arguments are not persuasive with respect to Yamakawa. However, Yamakawa has not been applied to the claims either in the instant Office Action or the Office Action mailed April 18, 2002.

If the Examiner intended to reject the claims, a more detailed explanation is requested.

Claims 1-6, 12-15, and 18-23 were provisionally rejected under Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 22, 24, 25, 28, and 29 of co-pending application 09/229,945.

The Examiner points out several differences between the claimed inventions of the two applications and merely alleges that these differences are obvious.

Applicants request a teaching from the prior art that such differences are obvious.

Claims 7-11, 16, 17, 24, and 25 were objected to for double patenting.

This objection is traversed for the reason cited above.

Claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

This rejection is traversed.

The Examiner alleges that $ex=+(1)$ differs from $ex=+(1-1)$.

"ex" is the error pattern in write current domain.

Let c, rc be write current pattern and recovered write current pattern, respectively.

example 1

original $c=\{1,0,0,0,1,1,0,1,0,0,1\}$
 recovered $rc=\{1,0,0,0,0,1,0,1,0,0,1\}$
 $ex=rc-c=\{0,0,0,0,-1,0,0,0,0,0,0\}$

example 2

original $c=\{1,0,0,0,1,1,0,1,0,0,1\}$
 recovered $rc=\{1,0,0,0,1,1,1,1,0,0,1\}$
 $ex=rc-c=\{0,0,0,0,0,0,1,0,0,0,0\}$

example 3

original $c=\{1,0,0,0,1,1,0,1,0,0,1\}$
 recovered $rc=\{1,0,0,1,1,1,0,1,0,0,1\}$
 $ex=rc-c=\{0,0,0,-1,0,0,0,0,0,0,0\}$

example 4

original $c=\{1,0,0,0,1,1,0,1,0,0,1\}$
 recovered $rc=\{1,0,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,0,1\}$
 $ex=rc-c=\{0,0,0,1,-1,0,0,0,0,0,0\}$

example 5

original $c=\{1,0,0,0,1,1,0,1,0,0,1\}$
 recovered $rc=\{1,0,0,0,1,0,1,1,0,0,1\}$
 $ex=rc-c=\{0,0,0,0,0,-1,1,0,0,0,0\}$

example 1 and 3 are corresponding to $ex=-\{1\}$
 example 2 is corresponding to $ex=+\{1\}$
 example 4 is corresponding to $ex=+\{1,-1\}$
 example 5 is corresponding to $ex=-\{1,-1\}$

In summary, the difference between errors $ex=+(1)$ and $ex=+(1,-1)$ is error pattern difference.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-25 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 and particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants believe is their invention.

Applicants appreciate the indication that Claims 10, 11, 16, 17, 24, and 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have overcome the rejections cited by the Examiner. Consequently, all of the claims are now allowable.


In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5633

Respectfully submitted,


W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,478